

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Impact of Federal Spending on the Economy and Welfare of the People of the State of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives from the State of New York are increasingly concerned with the harmful impact of Federal spending upon the economy and the general welfare of the people of the State of New York.

There is extensive unemployment in the State of New York. Federal defense spending has increased on the west coast, while New York State has suffered substantial cutbacks in this area. Federal aid programs increasingly siphon taxes from the people of the State of New York for redistribution to other States. The channeling of wealth out of the State of New York into other areas of the Nation is unjust per se. This process also tends to increase total taxes for New York business and allows other States to attract new industry and New York State industry with State and local tax reduction inducements.

In May 1959, the members of the Republican delegation from the State of New York unanimously agreed to request the Library of Congress to compile the pertinent facts to be used as a basis for remedial measures. The members of the Republican delegation from the State of New York are: JOHN TABER, CLARENCE E. KILBURN, DEAN P. TAYLOR, R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, WILLIAM E. MILLER, HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, J. ERNEST WHARTON, FRANK J. BECKER, AL-

BERT H. BOSCH, STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, FRANCIS C. DORN, PAUL A. FINO, JOHN R. PILLION, JOHN H. RAY, STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, EDWIN B. DOOLEY, HOWARD W. ROBISON, ROBERT R. BARRY, SEYMOUR HALPERN, JOHN V. LINDSAY, ALEXANDER PIRNIE, JESSICA MCC. WEIS, and CHARLES E. GOODELL.

On July 29, the Library of Congress submitted its report to this group. This study is confined to fiscal year 1958, ending June 30, 1958. The following extracted data glaringly points up the systematic Federal extraction of the wealth and earnings out of New York State's citizens:

New York's percentage of the Nation's population: 9.5 percent.

Percentage of Federal tax collected in New York State: 19.52 percent.

Federal tax revenues, fiscal year 1958: \$76.06 billion.

Federal taxes paid by New York State, adjusted on the basis of the origin of tax: \$10.1 billion.

Percentage of Federal tax paid by New York State on basis of origin of tax: 13.28 percent.

Total Federal expenditures, 1958: \$80.49 billion.

Federal expenditures and grants 1958 for New York State: \$7,565 billion.

Percentage of Federal expenditures and grants 1958 for New York State: 9.40 percent.

Net loss in 1958 to New York State—difference between tax revenues paid by origin and Federal expenditures plus grants to New York State: \$2.45 billion.

The net loss of \$2.45 billion amounts to the payment by each man, woman, and child in New York State of about \$155 more in Federal taxes than the average citizen of the United States. This huge sum of \$2.45 billion is more than the annual total tax revenues of the State of New York. It amounts to an overpayment to the Federal Government by the citizens of New York State of an

amount more than the total New York State tax.

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID

New York State is particularly and severely penalized in the field of Federal grants-in-aid. The expansion of this type of Federal activity is a most serious threat to the economy and the political well-being of the State of New York.

Federal grants-in-aid in the year 1925 amounted to \$124 million. Federal grants-in-aid in 1958 totaled \$7.42 billion, an increase of 6,000 percent over the space of 33 years.

In 1958, Federal aid payments in New York State were \$482 million out of the national figure of \$7.42 billion. The percentage receipts for New York State is 6.5 percent as compared to its population of 9.5 percent and its taxpayments—by origin—of 13.28 percent.

There are 105 different grants-in-aid. Each of them have different formulas or criteria for the distribution of Federal funds. There is no uniform or central rationale or objective.

In practical effect, Federal aid is socialization on the State level. Wealth and earnings are siphoned off from one group of States and redistributed to other States.

CONCLUDING REPORT

The Republican Members of the House representing the State of New York express their gratitude to the Library of Congress and particularly to the members of the staff who worked so diligently on this thorough and exhaustive report.

A concluding report is expected to be submitted by the Library of Congress in January 1960. This report will gather the statutes, formulas, rules, regulations, and policies relating to the allocation and expenditures of Federal funds to States or other geographic areas.

Summarizing, tables I and II of this report are presented:

TABLE I.—Estimates of Federal tax revenues by State of origin and expenditures by State of recipient or activity, fiscal year 1958

State	Aggregate		Amount per capita		Amount per \$1,000 of personal incomes ¹	
	Tax revenue by State of origin (see table III)	Expenditures by State of recipient or activity (see table VII)	Tax revenue (see table IV)	Expenditures (see table VII)	Tax revenue (see table IV)	Expenditures (see table VII)
Continental United States (total)	Millions \$76,063	Millions \$80,490	\$447	\$469	\$220	\$233
Alabama	795	1,244	251	390	191	298
Arizona	431	603	400	543	217	303
Arkansas	410	624	230	352	201	307
California	7,671	9,653	553	684	218	275
Colorado	723	918	435	544	217	275
Connecticut	1,563	1,503	689	656	246	237
Delaware	417	244	961	549	348	203
District of Columbia	534	1,097	652	1,333	256	525
Florida	2,004	1,999	476	462	267	266
Georgia	1,102	1,664	292	438	204	308
Idaho	234	227	363	347	224	217
Illinois	5,289	4,268	545	436	224	181
Indiana	1,775	1,804	394	397	195	198
Iowa	966	\$887	\$347	\$316	\$191	\$176
Kansas	761	1,465	362	695	199	384
Kentucky	844	1,091	277	356	202	262
Louisiana	966	1,079	315	349	201	225
Maine	359	455	382	481	229	290
Maryland	1,372	2,094	474	716	220	335
Massachusetts	2,575	2,687	533	555	227	246
Michigan	3,580	2,800	465	360	214	168
Minnesota	1,305	1,103	393	330	212	180
Mississippi	385	668	178	307	184	319
Missouri	1,840	1,867	434	439	223	226
Montana	255	281	379	414	202	223
Nebraska	522	547	363	378	198	207
Nevada	166	160	634	605	257	248
New Hampshire	260	269	437	465	235	253
New Jersey	3,054	2,860	544	505	217	204
New Mexico	280	512	345	618	200	366

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—Estimates of Federal tax revenues by State of origin and expenditures by State of recipient or activity, fiscal year 1958—Continued

State	Aggregate		Amount per capita		Amount per \$1,000 of personal incomes ¹		State	Aggregate		Amount per capita		Amount per \$1,000 of personal incomes ¹	
	Tax revenue by State of origin (see table III)	Expenditures by State of recipient or activity (see table VII)	Tax revenue (see table IV)	Expenditures (see table VII)	Tax revenue (see table IV)	Expenditures (see table VII)		Tax revenue by State of origin (see table III)	Expenditures by State of recipient or activity (see table VII)	Tax revenue (see table IV)	Expenditures (see table VII)	Tax revenue (see table IV)	Expenditures (see table VII)
	Millions	Millions						Millions	Millions				
New York.....	\$10,101	\$7,565	\$625	\$467	\$247	\$185	Texas.....	\$3,484	\$4,402	\$380	\$475	\$213	\$269
North Carolina.....	1,219	1,601	273	355	206	270	Utah.....	291	385	347	451	202	267
North Dakota.....	190	214	204	330	205	232	Vermont.....	151	130	408	349	241	207
Ohio.....	4,437	3,972	482	428	214	191	Virginia.....	1,318	2,539	344	654	209	403
Oklahoma.....	773	1,067	342	470	210	290	Washington.....	1,179	2,062	433	751	204	356
Oregon.....	711	610	408	347	210	180	West Virginia.....	591	534	301	272	193	174
Pennsylvania.....	5,325	4,472	484	404	228	192	Wisconsin.....	1,611	1,326	417	340	217	179
Rhode Island.....	406	501	474	579	237	292	Wyoming.....	143	174	450	546	221	271
South Carolina.....	529	899	223	377	189	322	Alaska ²	66	311	311	115	115	115
South Dakota.....	194	258	279	371	180	240	Hawaii ²	223	363	363	203	203	203
Tennessee.....	981	1,096	285	317	205	225							

¹ In the supporting tables, these amounts are expressed as percentages of personal incomes.² Not included in total or average for continental United States. The expenditure estimates apply only to the continental area (48 States and the District of Columbia).

TABLE II.—Percentages and index numbers for estimates of Federal tax revenues, by State of origin and expenditures by State of recipient or activity, fiscal year 1958

State	Estimated percent of continental United States		Index numbers (U.S. average=100)				State	Estimated percent of continental United States		Index numbers (U.S. average=100)			
	Tax revenue by State of origin (see table IV)	Expenditures by State of recipient or activity (see table VII)	Per capita amount relative to U.S. average		Amount per \$1,000 of personal incomes, relative to U.S. average			Tax revenue by State of origin (see table IV)	Expenditures by State of recipient or activity (see table VII)	Per capita amount relative to U.S. average		Amount per \$1,000 of personal incomes, relative to U.S. average	
			Tax revenue	Expenditures	Tax revenue	Expenditures				Tax revenue	Expenditures	Tax revenue	Expenditures
Continental United States: Total.....	100.00	100.00					Missouri.....	2.42	2.32	97	94	101	97
Average.....			100	100	100	100	Montana.....	.34	.35	85	88	92	96
Alabama.....	1.04	1.55	56	83	87	128	Nebraska.....	.69	.68	81	81	90	89
Arizona.....	.57	.75	90	116	98	130	Nevada.....	.22	.20	142	129	117	106
Arkansas.....	.54	.78	52	75	91	132	New Hampshire.....	.33	.33	98	99	107	108
California.....	10.08	11.99	124	146	99	118	New Jersey.....	4.02	3.56	122	108	98	87
Colorado.....	.95	1.14	97	116	98	118	New Mexico.....	.37	.64	77	132	91	157
Connecticut.....	2.05	1.88	154	140	112	102	New York.....	13.28	9.40	140	100	112	79
Delaware.....	.55	.30	215	117	158	87	North Carolina.....	1.60	1.99	61	76	93	116
District of Columbia.....	.70	1.36	146	285	116	225	North Dakota.....	.25	.27	66	70	93	99
Florida.....	2.64	2.48	107	99	121	114	Ohio.....	5.83	4.93	108	91	97	82
Georgia.....	1.45	2.07	65	94	93	132	Oklahoma.....	1.02	1.33	77	100	95	124
Idaho.....	.31	.28	81	74	102	93	Oregon.....	.93	.76	91	74	95	77
Illinois.....	6.95	5.30	122	93	102	78	Pennsylvania.....	7.00	5.56	108	86	104	82
Indiana.....	2.33	2.24	88	85	88	85	Rhode Island.....	.53	.62	106	124	107	125
Iowa.....	1.27	1.10	78	68	87	75	South Carolina.....	.70	1.12	50	80	86	138
Kansas.....	1.00	1.82	81	148	91	165	South Dakota.....	.25	.32	63	79	82	103
Kentucky.....	1.11	1.36	62	76	92	112	Tennessee.....	1.29	1.36	64	68	93	98
Louisiana.....	1.27	1.84	71	75	91	96	Texas.....	4.58	5.47	85	101	97	114
Maine.....	.47	.57	86	103	104	125	Utah.....	.38	.48	78	96	92	115
Maryland.....	1.80	2.60	106	153	100	144	Vermont.....	.20	.16	91	75	110	89
Massachusetts.....	3.39	3.34	119	118	103	106	Virginia.....	1.73	3.15	77	140	95	173
Michigan.....	4.71	3.48	104	77	97	72	Washington.....	1.55	2.56	97	160	92	153
Minnesota.....	1.72	1.37	88	70	96	77	West Virginia.....	.78	.66	67	58	87	75
Mississippi.....	.51	.83	40	66	83	137	Wisconsin.....	2.12	1.65	93	73	99	77
							Wyoming.....	.19	.22	101	117	100	116
							Alaska ¹09		70		52	
							Hawaii ¹29		81		92	

¹ Not included in total or average for continental United States.

C. D. McNamee, Great Newspaperman and Outstanding Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, a great newspaperman, and one of Michigan's outstanding citizens recently retired as editor of the Muskegon (Mich.) Chronicle published in the Ninth Congressional District, which I have the honor to repre-

sent. Mr. C. D. McNamee steps down after he devoted 51 years of his life earning a reputation as one of Michigan's top journalists.

Mr. McNamee's distinguished newspaper career began in 1908 with the Owosso (Mich.) Press-American. He served as a reporter and editor with the Detroit Tribune from 1911 to 1917. When he left the old Detroit Tribune 42 years ago, he joined the staff of the Muskegon Chronicle, serving first as a county and city reporter, then as associate editor beginning in 1925, and managing editor beginning in 1936, and, finally, as editor since 1950.

His many readers and those who have worked for him over the years revere and

respect Mr. McNamee as a man who knows his business as a newspaperman, who is firm in his convictions, and who has never hesitated to take a forthright public position on vital issues affecting his community, State and Nation.

Throughout the period of his editorship, Mr. McNamee was eminently successful in his dedicated efforts to publish a newspaper which was interesting to read, complete in its coverage of national and local affairs, forthrightly independent in its leadership in public affairs, and highly influential not only in western Michigan but throughout the State.

In addition to the long hours which he spent at his editor's desk, Mr. McNamee always found time for great

personal sacrifices in time and effort in a wide variety of civic activities. To mention only a few of his community interests, Mr. McNamee provided outstanding leadership in the organization of the West Shore Symphony, the Muskegon Civic Theater Association, the Greater Muskegon Community Chest; he has been a tireless leader in the Boy Scouts organization; and he pioneered the establishment of the commission-manager form of city government for Muskegon.

Over the years, he has been the recipient of many honors and awards for distinguished service; for example, he received the distinguished service award of the Michigan Department of the Marine Corps League, he was cited by Temple B'nai Israel in 1952 as the outstanding Christian of the year, and, more recently, a special resolution of appreciation was adopted by the Muskegon City Commission in recognition of his leadership in successful community efforts to attract new industry to Muskegon.

A few months ago, Mr. McNamee received the annual award of the Michigan United Conservation Clubs, honoring the Muskegon Chronicle as the outstanding newspaper in the State of Michigan for its reporting of conservation news.

Mr. McNamee has been active for many years in such professional organizations as the American Society of Newspapermen, the Michigan Press Association, the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, and the University of Michigan Press Association. He served as a lecturer in the University of Michigan School of Journalism.

He has always taken a particular interest and genuine pride in the training of young journalists. His cub reporters usually found him to be a rough taskmaster at the beginning, but they soon learned that his example and demanding standards provided invaluable guidelines for their own careers.

Mr. McNamee's half-century of service as a newspaperman and civic leader stands as a record of outstanding achievement worthy of the attention and recognition of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Congress and my constituents, I warmly extend to Mr. McNamee the wish that he may enjoy many happy years of retirement and good health.

Petroleum Industry Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the 100th anniversary of the birth of the petroleum industry in Titusville, Pa., August 27, 1859, was celebrated the week of August 23 through 29, 1959.

It was indeed a great honor to have the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield,

the Postmaster General of the United States, as the speaker on the auspicious occasion of the dedication of a new postage stamp, issued in commemoration of the drilling of the first commercial oil well by Col. Edwin Drake.

As a Member of Congress from the 24th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I consider that it was a high tribute to my district and to the oil industry to have the Postmaster General take time out of his busy schedule to make this contribution to the success of the oil centennial.

Income Tax Deductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a bill I introduced today to allow our taxpayers a deduction for income tax purposes for all charges levied by a municipality, county or other local government. The term "charges" refers to any tax, special assessment, fee, or other service charges which is established and imposed by the local government for the performance of a service or the provision of a local improvement, which the taxpayer has no option to reject. These public services include sewage disposal, water, garbage-trash collection, utilities, recreation, roadbuilding, welfare, and other services deemed necessary or desirable.

The need for consideration of such legislation was called to my attention by a very active civic group in my congressional district. The Opa-locka (Fla.) Civic Improvement League conducted a survey of 114 cities located in 44 States to determine what services they were providing their residents and the methods used in financing the services. Results of the survey showed some cities finance public services through general revenue collections; others by imposition of service charges for the individual items; others by a combination of both methods. In all cases, there is a wide variance in the rate of taxation or assessment; one thing they all have in common: the charge is imposed by the local government, the taxpayer having no option to reject it.

Under existing law, taxes paid which tend to increase the value of the property assessed are not deductible from income tax. On the other hand, taxes paid directly under the classification of "real property taxes"—which in some cities support all or most of the public services—are tax deductible. Therefore, in those communities where the real-property tax is substantial and there is little or no use made of the so-called service charge, fee, or assessment, the taxpayers residing therein enjoy a tax deduction for these payments. In other commu-

nities where the tax rate on real property is low and the revenue to finance public services is collected through individual service charges or fees, these residents are not allowed such a tax advantage on the theory that such taxes tend to increase the value of the property assessed. This policy penalizes the citizens of those communities where the local government is forced to levy these service charges and assessments in order to equitably distribute the cost of municipal services and public improvements.

I submit the basic theory for discriminating between these two types of charges is unrealistic and outmoded. We have witnessed in the last 20 years a tremendous mushrooming of our communities with the resultant demand for more and better roads, hospitals, sewage systems, water-supply facilities, and the like. With the wide range of revenue sources already tapped by the Federal Government, local governments are hard-pressed for taxing sources with which to provide and support such services. The service-charge method therefore has been gaining in popularity, as a means to furnish necessary and needed services and improvements.

In the interest of being fair and treating all taxpayers equitably, I feel it should make no difference to the Federal Government whether or not local service and improvements are financed under the general taxation method or the special taxation method.

Congress took a step in this direction when the law was amended in 1954 to allow a deduction for taxes assessed by special districts for debt retirement and capital purposes. To be deductible, the assessment must be levied annually at a uniform rate on the same assessed value of real property in the district, including improvements, as is used for purposes of the real property tax generally. Deduction was also allowed for the amount of local taxes properly allocable to maintenance or interest charges.

With the tremendous variance in the rate of taxation or assessment and with the different methods of collection in common use, I feel the Congress should seriously consider this legislation making all charges imposed by municipalities tax deductible. Then it will be up to each local government to collect for these functions in the manner best suited to its own individual situation.

I introduced this bill today in the hope that the Ways and Means Committee will request the appropriate governmental reports on this question and that all individuals and groups who share an interest in it, will participate in the consideration of it. The bill and this statement in support of it are necessarily broad and I would expect more definitive amendments would be made to it after consideration by the committee. While it is expected that the Treasury Department will once again voice its opposition to the bill because of the anticipated loss of revenue, I feel that justice to all taxpayers and the interest that this Government certainly has in the development of our communities will far outweigh any such objection.

Savoia Lodge, Sons of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent excerpt from the celebrated Clinton Daily Item containing remarks in part which I made at the 50th anniversary celebration of the Savoia Lodge, Sons of Italy. This occasion was one of several very well arranged programs which were formulated by the able committee in charge of the lodge's 50th anniversary celebration.

The banquet was held in the imposing edifice, the Clinton Town Hall, and was largely attended by members of the organization, their families and many of their friends, including distinguished leaders of the bar, bench, and the public service.

I felt privileged indeed to add my voice to those which were raised in praise of the lodge; its members; its illustrious history, its many contributions to the country, the vital and inspiring role which citizens of Italian ancestry have played in developing the economy, strengthening of the Nation in peacetime and defending the country in time of peril. It would take many phrases indeed to elaborate adequately upon the great achievements and loyal citizenship and service of our dear friends of Italian ancestry.

Many volumes could be written on this subject, yet I was proud on this occasion to add my humble words to many that were spoken about the contributions of this outstanding group of Americans.

The people of the rich Italian heritage are very dear to me and have been a source of constant encouragement and support. I express warm gratitude to them for their inspiring loyalty and monumental achievements.

May this great, outstanding group continue to receive choicest blessings of the good Lord. May they steadfastly move into the future re-inspired and rededicated to the high ideals they exemplify.

The excerpts follow:

CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN PAYS TRIBUTE TO
SAVOIA MEMBERS

Speaking at the 50th anniversary of Savoia Lodge, Sons of Italy, Saturday night, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN highly extolled the contributions of that body and the Italo-American group as a whole.

"The patriotism, loyalty and achievements of people of Italian blood in war and in peace in behalf of the community, State, and Nation could never be exceeded by any other group," said PHILBIN.

"The history of this great organization in our beautiful town covers a period of marked material progress and advancement never before equaled in the entire history of the world.

"But it has been a period of great stress and turmoil as well—three bloody wars and now the cold war, an uneasy peace so-called,

severely testing the fiber, stamina and courage of our people.

"It has been the hard work, honest, law-abiding, God-fearing citizenship of your group, and other fine Americans like you, your faith in and devotion to basic spiritual values of religion and patriotism that has enabled you to play such a vital, constructive role in sustaining the moral integrity and the safety and security of the Nation.

"With your great reliance in the Almighty and your high purpose and determination to preserve your ideals and rich heritage, the future of your great organization is bound to be a continued and growing contribution to Clinton and the country.

"I heartily congratulate and compliment you and wish for you all very many happy, glorious, successful years of service to your fellow man and devotion to our great Nation."

Monetary Gimmicks Are No Substitute for
Fiscal Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in the last three decades the United States has spent itself into a position of impending financial crisis. That crisis is inevitable only if we disregard the warning signs, continue the mistakes of the past 30 years, and refuse to deal forthrightly with our Nation's fiscal affairs.

The record of the past 30 years indicates that despite unprecedented tax burdens we have spent more than our income so that the public indebtedness has increased 17-fold from \$16.8 billion in 1931 to upwards of \$290 billion at the present time. In the last 30 years the Federal Government has had annual budgetary deficits in 25 years, or 83 percent of the time, ranging from the smallest annual deficit of \$462 million up to \$54 billion. It is not being a Cassandra to say that if we continue in the next 5 years the mistakes we have made in the past 30 years, we will be inviting inflation, retarding economic growth, and possibly bringing about the destruction of our free enterprise economy.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has said that matters dealing with debt management are the most important legislative issues to come before the Congress in the current session. The President was not crying, "Wolf"; he was not advocating a resort to fiscal gimmicks. He was admonishing the Nation that we must face the fiscal and economic facts with realistic determination to put our house in order. The simple truths are: we cannot spend ourselves rich; we cannot pay today's bills with tomorrow's taxes; we cannot solve anything with fiscal quackery; we cannot repeal basic economic laws even if we were willing to accept totalitarian regimentation; we must govern ourselves with fiscal rhyme and monetary reason.

Mr. Speaker, I recently noticed in the RECORD that one of my distinguished colleagues was advocating what I regard as the gimmick approach to dealing with our Nation's fiscal affairs. It was alleged by this colleague that it was the administration that had raised the interest rates, and that it was the administration that had imposed higher interest rates, not only on the American people, but also on the other nations of the free world. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that my distinguished colleague was wrong in his ascribed reasons for rising interest rates, wrong in his analysis of their effect, and wrong in his proposed solution.

Mr. Speaker, this colleague stated that all that was necessary to enable the Treasury Department to sell Government bonds at 4½ percent or less was for the administration simply to reduce interest rates. He implied that this could be done by requiring the Federal Reserve to support the Government bond market. This would mean that the Federal Reserve would stand ready, as it did for the 9 inflation-ridden years ending in 1951, to buy all Government bonds offered by holders, presumably at par.

Let us look at the plan proposed by this gimmick advocate so that it can be seen for exactly what it is—an inflation-spawning monster.

The active money supply of this country is now about \$140 billion. Moreover, about \$140 billion of marketable Government securities are held by private investors. What my colleague is advocating, then, is that the Federal Reserve adopt policies that could almost immediately add this additional \$140 billion or so to the existing money supply. Because, if any investor, at any time and regardless of conditions, could convert his marketable Government securities into cash at par, these securities would in fact be the equivalent of money.

It does not take an expert in economic theory to realize the disastrous consequences of a doubling of the money supply in a short time. We would be doubling the flow of money to purchase available goods and services. This would have a major impact on the cost of living and would destroy meaningful economic growth. With the economy already operating at a very high level, the only possible result would be galloping inflation. This would inevitably be followed by a financial crisis involving wholesale redemptions of savings bonds—of which more than \$50 billion are outstanding—and determined efforts by people both here and abroad to get rid of dollars so as to purchase property, gold, other currencies—anything that appeared safe.

This is not the whole story—my colleague who advocates that the Federal Reserve should peg the Government bond market understands full well that when the Federal Reserve buys \$1 of Government securities, the purchase provides the basis for a \$6 expansion in bank deposits and the money supply. So what we have here is the advocacy of a plan that could promote new money creation with a vengeance, along with the crippling inflation that would be sure to follow.

Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for us to call a spade a spade. To promise to all private holders of Government securities that they can always get dollar for dollar for their securities is tantamount to financing the Government's requirements by cranking up the printing press and issuing greenbacks. Why bother to issue securities in the first place. If they are to be freely convertible into cash? Why not save the cost of printing the securities by taking the direct step of printing the money?

The advocates of Federal Reserve Board support of Government bond prices point out that we had Federal Reserve support prior to 1951 and claim that things did not turn out badly then. Wholesale prices doubled during that period. I wouldn't call that an exactly happy development. It is true that during part of that time our Nation was at war but the primary fault for the inflation was the manner in which we financed the war—too much money creation, too much reliance on Federal Reserve support of the Government's securities market, too much of exactly the same type of policies that my colleague is advocating today, in a period of peace and prosperity.

My colleague who was speaking in the well of the House the other day went on to say that the so-called high interest rate policies in this country have brought about high interest rates abroad. Germany was mentioned as an example. I don't believe that any one could convince the German people—especially the older generation—which recalls the disastrous inflation of the 1920's—that sound money, even if it means high interest rates, is to be avoided. The German people know what inflation means and what it can do. They know that it wiped out their savings, paralyzed their industry, and provided the basis for a rise to power of one of the most ruthless dictatorships this world has ever known. And they know too that their phenomenal economic gain since the end of World War II could not have been possible without the discipline of sound money.

These people abroad—the Germans, the French, and many others—have learned from bitter experience that you cannot compromise with inflation. They are now showing that they are willing to accept the disciplines that are essential if integrity of their currencies is to be maintained. And they realize full well that a central bank is not a toy to be used for money creation at the whim of the easy money inflationists. Instead, the central bank must be a responsible institution that is devoted first, last, and always to the true economic well-being of all the people.

Mr. Speaker, if these advocates of printing press money and Federal Reserve Government financing want inflation, if they want a managed economy with governmental regimentation, if they want to destroy the value of the dollar, let them advocate such a position without posing in the posture of one who has an easy solution to a grave and serious national problem. In that way the American people will be able to de-

cide what course our Nation should take—the road to inflationary disaster or the road to fiscal discipline through paying our own way.

Imports and Our Domestic Mass Production Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, within the past few years the foreign commerce of the United States has undergone revolutionary changes of vast long-range significance to this Nation and every citizen in it. Yet, so far, only a few isolated voices have been raised to point out the tremendous problems created by this transformation in our trade.

For the first time, the emphasis in our import trade has shifted to manufactured goods produced in mass volume by some of the largest domestic industries. Automobiles are a prime example; steel is another; electrical appliances and office equipment are others.

These great mass-production industries, providing employment for hundreds of thousands of workers, are those to which the Nation will look first to provide jobs for our expanding population. In the next 10 years, our economy must create employment for 10 million to 15 million more Americans. This can only be accomplished if our largest industries set the pace for economic expansion.

However, in many instances, it is these very industries which now confront intensified competition from abroad, not only in the U.S. market but in export markets the world over. Under these conditions, can we reasonably expect industrial expansion to keep pace with the job requirements of our growing population?

American taxpayers, under decisions and commitments made by their Government representatives, have pumped tens of billions of dollars in economies abroad. The unprecedented generosity of the American people has restored the world economy, raising standards of living to new heights, opening new vistas of opportunity and prosperity to free peoples everywhere.

No thoughtful American will begrudge the fact that our friends abroad have never had it so good. As citizens of the most prosperous nation in all history, Americans faced up to the obligations of international brotherhood. Willingly, we have diverted great shares of wealth and resources to those less fortunate, so that they too could enjoy the fruits of free men's initiative, imagination, and enterprise.

However, there must be a limit to the sacrifices that a single nation, however great and prosperous, can make in behalf of its friends and allies. There must be a point of diminishing return, a point at which the cost becomes too great to

justify the effort. I suggest that we have reached this point insofar as our foreign trade policies have contributed to the dynamic development of competitive economies abroad.

Two recent accounts of thriving conditions in foreign mass-producing industries underscore this fact. Both reports appeared in the magazine *Business Week*:

FOREIGN STEELMAKERS BOOST OUTPUT, ENLARGE THEIR SHARE OF WORLD MARKET

With the steel strike in its sixth week, executives of the struck U.S. mills are closely watching the speedy progress of steelmakers in Western Europe and Japan. Foreign steel companies are boosting their share of world steel markets—including the United States. Steelmakers in West Germany and Japan are enjoying the liveliest boom. But steel output is also curving upward in France, Britain, and Italy.

In West Germany, steel producers are headed for a new output record of more than 30 million tons. Renewed capital investment and machinery exports have helped boost demand this year.

In Japan, the industry has been setting records all year, thanks to rising exports and a capital spending boom. With production likely to top 15 million tons this year—about 2 million tons over 1958—Japan threatens to displace France as the world's fifth largest steelmaker. Some of Japan's steel companies are getting ready to ask the World Bank for loans for a \$300 million expansion program to raise capacity to 25 million tons in 1965.

In Britain, steel output has reached 80 percent of the industry's 26-million-ton capacity. While investment still remains low, an upsurge in autos and appliances is adding to steel consumption. Auto production, in fact, has been gobbling up steel so fast that a shortage of sheet is feared.

In France, steel production has climbed almost 5 percent above last year's record level. Aided by devaluation, the French industry has managed to improve its share of Europe's growing steel market by being able to offer lower prices.

In Italy, steelmakers also enjoy expanding sales because of the Common Market. One sign of expansion is the Government's proposal to establish a new 1-million-ton steel plant in southern Italy.

TRANSISTOR RADIO MAKERS WILL MARKET JAPANESE MODELS UNDER U.S. LABELS

In the past year, the U.S. electronics industry has watched Japanese manufacturers grab more than half the market here for transistor radios—largely by sales under Japanese labels. Now, some companies have decided to meet the foreign competition by marketing Japanese-made radios under their own U.S. trade names.

Latest transistor radio manufacturer to join the importers is big Emerson Radio & Phonograph Corp. Through its international bargaining subsidiary, Emerson has concluded an agreement with Tokyo's Standard Radio Corp. to import 100,000 radios in coming months. Emerson officials say it is making the move because Japanese companies are making radios and parts too small to be produced competitively in the United States. Emerson, which will sell the imports under its Jefferson Travis label, follows Motorola, Inc., as the second big radio maker to move into the Japanese import field.

Meanwhile, Tokyo's Ministry of International Trade and Industry is spurring Japanese efforts to make electronic computers. MITI plans to sponsor a company—50 percent privately owned—to produce 50 computers next year, and more than that in each succeeding year.

The American steel industry provides perhaps the classic current study of import penetration into a long-established, mass-production domestic industry. Even before the strike, imports were climbing dramatically. In the first 6 months of 1959, nearly 2 million tons of foreign steel landed here, against some 1.7 million tons in all of 1958.

With domestic manufacturers immobilized by the work stoppage, foreign steel producers are devoting every effort to gaining a strong and permanent foothold in the American market, as well as capturing American markets abroad. And regardless of the outcome of the strike, there is considerable doubt that American steelmakers will be able to regain these losses.

For instance, one of this country's largest can manufacturers is now buying tinplate from Great Britain for its factories on the west coast. Even though this tinplate is shipped thousands of miles, and through the Panama Canal, it is still 5 percent cheaper than tinplate manufactured in California.

The chief executive of a major American steel company added a new dimension to the competition facing his industry when he reported that agents of Japanese steel producers insist that American customers agree to continue buying their steel after the strike ends if they expect to receive any now.

Another problem worrying the American steel industry is the rising volume of imports of foreign products in which steel is a primary component. Automobiles are a case in point. Imports of foreign cars will probably exceed 600,000 in 1959, compared to 57,000 in 1955 and 260,000 in 1957.

Exports of American cars, on the other hand, have declined appreciably. If the present export pace continues, our auto exports will not exceed 115,000 in 1959, or less than 25 percent of the import volume. A scant 10 years ago we exported 10 cars for every 1 we imported.

Signs of crisis abound throughout our foreign trade structure. More than 2 million transistor radios will reach here from Japan in 1959; in fact, 6 of every 10 Japanese transistor sets exported find their way into the American market.

Imports of steel pipe and tubing surpassed 200,000 tons last year, upon nearly 300 percent since 1955, and so far this year imports are running some 30 percent ahead of last year's pace.

As my committee colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] informed the House a few days ago, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is stitched with British wire because American producers, meeting American wage standards, cannot match their competitors' prices.

In 1950 the United States imported 2,000 tons of wire rope; in the first 5 months of 1959 imports of this product exceeded 16,000 tons. Records of the Independent Wire Rope Manufacturers Association reveal that the U.S. Navy, a large buyer of wire rope, gives most of its business to foreign mills. In 1958 the Navy's General Stores Supply Office in Philadelphia bought \$470,144 worth of wire rope; of this sum, 73 percent, or

nearly \$350,000, went to oversea manufacturers.

In the last fiscal year, the Tennessee Valley Authority, a large consumer of heavy electrical equipment, paid nearly \$18 million to foreign manufacturers of turbines and generators. This was more than three times the total outlay by TVA for foreign-made goods in all previous 25 years of its existence.

It is not really necessary at this time to reexamine the reasons for the amazing upsurge of import competition. It can be summed up simply: We cannot match their prices.

And one of the major factors in our failure to remain competitive in a broad range of industries is clearly illustrated by a few uncomplicated statistics, as follows:

In West Germany the average hourly wage for nonfarm workers is 53 cents; in France, 62 cents—and that makes French workers the highest paid in the European Common Market; in Italy, 34 cents; in the Netherlands, 38 cents; in Benelux, 53 cents. Surprisingly, all of these hourly rates, pitifully low by our standards, reflect increases of 19 to 38 percent since 1955.

The American garment industry, sorely distressed by a flood of imports from the Far East, supply additional data on comparative wages. The American garment worker draws \$2.12 per hour, including fringe benefits, for a 40-hour week. The Japanese garment worker receives 14 cents, including fringe benefits, for a 50-hour week; the garment worker in Hong Kong is even worse off, collecting less than 10 cents per hour. Labor costs account for about one-third of the total cost of manufacturing men's suits.

With such a disparity in wage rates at home and abroad, it is not surprising that more than 3,000 American companies, including 99 of our 100 biggest industrial corporations, are now engaged in production at overseas facilities. It is not surprising that direct U.S. private investment abroad has more than doubled since 1950. It is not surprising that American business expects sales from its foreign operations to increase at twice or more the pace of export sales in the next 10 years.

In short, the problems created by current trends in foreign commerce, especially when weighed against the urgency of creating at least 10 million more jobs at home in the next decade, seem so clear cut, so starkly defined, as to preclude all argument over their validity.

Yet that is not the case at all. We are still belabored by demands for more tariff handouts, for more relaxation of our import laws. Truly, there is precious little left to give away. In the past 25 years, in a lonely and largely futile quest for real reciprocity, the United States has pared its tariffs until they are now among the lowest in the world—as even the most ardent free trader will concede.

Moreover, the outlook is that things will get worse before they get better. A year ago the Congress saw fit, for reasons beyond my comprehension, to authorize still further cuts in our frail

tariff structure. The administration was granted power to reduce tariffs by another 20 percent over the next 4 years; much of this authority will be called into play when the United States joins its partners in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at the bargaining table in January 1961.

Fortunately, the GATT negotiations are still many months away. There is still time to alert the American people, to bring the facts, however distressing, to the attention of citizens across the land. There is still time to prevent another headlong sprint down the road to economic catastrophe and still time to save countless thousands of American jobs at a time when we cannot afford to lose a single one.

I know that many of my colleagues have pledged themselves to this task. I know, too, that our ranks will grow as more and more American industries become imperiled. As a nation, we are coming to our senses—slowly, to be sure, but we are getting there. We can only wonder how many more plants will close, how many more jobs will disappear, before our eyes are completely opened.

Schedule of Conferences and Visits With Residents of the Fourth District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Congressman should be in his district to confer and visit with his constituents whenever official duties do not require him to be in Washington.

When Congress adjourns in a few days, I expect to return home and to be available for conferences and visits with residents of the Fourth District in the courthouse of each county seat between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Allen County, Lima: Wednesday, September 30.

Auglaize County, Wapakoneta: Tuesday, October 6.

Darke County, Greenville: Monday, October 5.

Mercer County, Celina: Wednesday, October 7.

Miami County, Troy: Tuesday, September 29.

Preble County, Eaton: Thursday, October 1.

Shelby County, Sidney: Monday, September 28.

No appointments will be necessary. Any problem with, or opinion concerning, the Federal Government will be proper subject for conference.

Of course, I will be glad to see residents of the district, in my Piqua office, any time that Congress is not in session, except on the days scheduled above.

Not To See but To Be Seen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, patriots everywhere are saddened and alarmed over the Khrushchev invitation. The result is going to be a great political revolt in 1960. The American people are not going to stand for this appeasement with the "Butcher of Budapest."

I commend to the Congress and to freedom loving people everywhere the following broadcast by Dean Clarence E. Manion over the Manion Forum network September 6, 1959:

KHRUSHCHEV VISIT MOST SERIOUS MISTAKE IN AMERICAN HISTORY

DEAN MANION. It is undoubtedly safe to say that President Eisenhower is the most popular man in the world. Press and public, here and everywhere, respond to him with unprecedented enthusiasm.

When the President makes an obvious mistake in the administration of his high office, important, influential criticism is hard to find, and even more difficult to publicize when it is found.

This being so, we must wait for history to weigh the full gravity of Mr. Eisenhower's great mistake in inviting Nikita Khrushchev to visit this country in exchange for a subsequent visit by our President to the Soviet Union.

From my own researches into congressional feelings on this subject, I am convinced that, without the force of the President's personal persuasion, a proposal for such a visitatorial exchange would have been voted down in House and Senate by a margin more than 4 to 1.

Nevertheless, when the President suddenly announced that Khrushchev was coming, all but a few of these congressional opponents shrouded themselves in silence.

Fortunately, there were notable exceptions. As soon as he could get from his sick bed to the Senate floor, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, put the scandalous history of Nikita Khrushchev into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in one of the most learned, powerful and persuasive Senate speeches that has been heard in modern times. If you want the whole sordid story of the President's upcoming Communist guest of honor, read this revealing speech by Senator DODD. The Manion Forum will mail you a copy for the asking.

In Washington last week, I asked Senator DODD for a short statement to be included in this broadcast. Here it is:

"Senator DODD. I hope that during Khrushchev's visit we shall hear church bells in the land tolling their remembrance for the murdered millions behind the Iron Curtain. I hope that there will be public observance of prayer for the deliverance of the captive nations.

"I am not opposed to a meeting between the President and Khrushchev at a proper time, under proper conditions, and in a proper place, but I think it is a national disgrace to give this Red dictator a state visit as the guest of the American people at this time in our country with all the fancy trimmings."

DEAN MANION. The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, is the ranking member of the President's own party in the

Senate. He has been a Member of that distinguished body continuously since 1937. I asked Senator BRIDGES to give me his opinion of the Khrushchev invitation. Here is what he said:

"Senator BRIDGES. I have strongly opposed Khrushchev's coming to this country. I am still strongly opposed. I can foresee no good from his visit and I fear his presence here will further soften some of our more complacent citizens and discourage and dishearten people in Communist captivity as well as our own free world allies."

DEAN MANION. One of the most able, energetic and influential Members on the Republican side of the U.S. Senate is the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona. I had the good fortune to see him in Washington. For the benefit of his friends in the Manion Forum nationwide radio audience, Senator GOLDWATER said this:

"Senator GOLDWATER. I believe that the invitation to Mr. Khrushchev to visit the United States is a propaganda and psychological victory for the Russians. They attempted to achieve this through the summit conference and, failing there, they were able to achieve this invitation.

"If Mr. Khrushchev comes to this country and is invited to the U.S. Senate, such as has been suggested, the junior Senator from Arizona will certainly vote against his being there, and if he is invited, the Senator is going to be conspicuous by his absence. I see no reason to be overjoyous in our welcome to this land of this murderous brand of communism that Khrushchev is spreading across the world."

DEAN MANION. One of the American ports of call arranged for Khrushchev by his managers in Washington is Des Moines, Iowa. This puts the Honorable Herschel Loveless, Governor of that great State into the position of official host to Khrushchev, whether the Governor likes it or not.

From the newspapers, I gathered the impression that the Governor of Iowa did not like it, and so, through our affiliated station KWDM, at Des Moines, I went to the Governor for verification. Here is our recorded interview:

"Governor Loveless, I understand that you are something less than enthusiastic about Khrushchev's prospective visit to the United States. Is that true?"

"Governor LOVELESS. Yes, Dean Manion, I have qualms and misgivings about the pending Khrushchev visit. I expect to receive him in Iowa as I would any foreign visitor and will try to be as hospitable as we Iowans are noted to be, but I fear the reaction on our many allies throughout the world on our receiving someone from the Communist area, and I am sure that they might be wondering just what is going on and if we are deserting them."

SOUTHERN GOVERNOR POINTS UP DANGERS

DEAN MANION. In a dispatch from the recent Governors' conference at Puerto Rico, I read that the popular and personable Governor of South Carolina, the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, also had misgivings about the upcoming visit of Mr. Khrushchev. With the help of our affiliated station WIS, in Columbia, I obtained the following statement from Governor Hollings in South Carolina:

"Governor HOLLINGS. The foreign policy of the United States is to win over to the free world the neutral nations and promote the resistance of the captive nations. To support this policy; we have pledged that we will resist any further aggression by communism. This firm policy has created hope and courage within the neutral and captive nations.

"However, when we accept Khrushchev as a political and social visitor to the United States, we cannot help to a degree giving stature to what he stands for—tyranny, murder, and communism. The neutral and captive nations immediately lose hope and

courage, and our struggle for world peace suffers irreparable harm."

DEAN MANION. One of the most respected and influential men in America is retired Adm. Ben Moreell, of Pittsburgh, former chairman of Republic Steel Corp. Admiral Moreell is now the guiding spirit of Americans for Constitutional Action, a powerful working organization of American patriots. Through our affiliate, station WCAE in Pittsburgh, I obtained the following statement from Admiral Moreell on the subject of Khrushchev's visit:

"Admiral MOREELL. Mr. Khrushchev's visit raises disturbing questions as to its political, economic, defense, and moral implications. Since we are a people whose trust is in God and whose social structure cannot endure without that direction which stems from our religious beliefs, the moral aspects of this visit overshadow all others.

"We should then ask these questions: Do we, by inviting him to our shores, give moral sanction to his past misdeeds and those of the Government he represents? Are we prepared to endorse as conforming with Judeo-Christian moral values their cruelties to the peoples of Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Tibet, and other enslaved countries?

"Do such actions conform to our concept of the nature of things as they should be? The answers are clear. Although he is an invited guest, we must not by any act of public or private acclaim indicate that we condone his inhumanity."

DEAN MANION. My friends, these are samples of responsible patriotic opinion concerning this most ominous event of our lifetime. It would take hours to evaluate all of the similar opinions that I have received and observed since the fateful announcement was on August 3.

For instance, Eugene Lyons, a newsman with long experience in Moscow and now a senior editor of Reader's Digest, said in a public speech (UPI, Madison, Wis., Aug. 26) that the invitation to Khrushchev was a political mistake which could be turned into a political catastrophe. It will add dimensions of prestige to world communism. It could spread defeatist gloom among millions of our friends and secret allies within the Communist world.

Chief Justice M. T. Phelps, of the Arizona State Supreme Court, wrote a public letter of protest in which he told the President that "your invitation involves the moral integrity of the sovereign citizens of whom you are the servant. It involves a flagrant breach of your duty to the people. You have invited and propose to break bread with the arch-murderer of all ages."

At the American Legion convention in Minneapolis, Vice President Nixon made an eloquent plea in defense of Khrushchev's visit to this country and urged the assembled legionnaires to do nothing that might upset President Eisenhower's bold plan to melt some of the ice around the cold war.

The delegates listened politely and then passed a resolution demanding an end to diplomatic relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, unless the Kremlin releases American soldiers and citizens now held behind the Iron Curtain; holds free elections in the satellite countries, and ends espionage against America.

What is wrong with these sensible, moral, and self-respecting prerequisites for continued diplomatic association with any government worthy of the name? Nothing could be better calculated to melt the ice of the cold war than the Kremlin's prompt compliance with these conditions.

Will the President, therefore, please present this resolution from his old comrades-in-arms to his upcoming guest of honor and get an official reply for all of the American people?

The wives and mothers of the 11 missing American airmen deliberately shot down by Russian fighter planes over Soviet Armenia just 1 year ago would like to know where these men are and when, if ever, they are to be returned to this country. Will these wives and mothers be permitted to speak to our distinguished guest of honor? If they are denied access to him, as they undoubtedly will be, then will not the President or the Vice President please speak for them?

NIKITA JOCKEYS IKE TO AIRPORT

The President and the Vice President have defended this unfortunate invitation by their determination to show Khrushchev the might and power of this country, lest he start a war in ignorance of our ability to strike back. Khrushchev has now let it be known that he has other ideas.

He is not looking for a balanced picture of the United States of America. On the contrary, he wants to appear before large crowds in big cities where he can expect top newspaper, radio, and television coverage.

Khrushchev is not coming here to see, but to be seen; not to learn, but to teach; not to be softened, but to further soften our already badly weakened resistance to the satanic evil of communism, of which he is the personification.

The wily conspirator has already seized the propaganda initiative from President Eisenhower. Mr. Eisenhower had explained that, since Premier Khrushchev was not the titular head of the Soviet state, that position being held by one Kliment Voroshilov, the President would not be required to greet him at the airport.

That was all Khrushchev needed to know. He immediately announced that, for the purpose of this trip, Voroshilov is deposed and Nikita himself will be the head of the Soviet state when he gets to Washington.

So, President Eisenhower must meet the big burglar at the airport after all, and ride with him through the streets of Washington. You will see it all on television. So will the enslaved people of the captive nations—Khrushchev will take care of that.

Mrs. Khrushchev is coming, too, which will bring the official Washington hostesses into the big act—Mrs. Eisenhower, Mrs. Nixon. More pictures, more propaganda, all calculated to cause the hopes of the Communist-held slaves to curl up and die. Says the Indianapolis Star (August 27):

"After (all) this has been done, America can never look quite the same to the victims of barbarism everywhere who have looked to America as the champion of right and justice. They will feel, rightly, that America has turned its back on them and on its own great principles of liberty and justice for all."

In the Khrushchev visit, President Eisenhower is sowing a wicked whirlwind. It will take all of his great popularity to ride him through the resulting storm.

Farm Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when farm imports exceed farm exports in our country with its overwhelming farm surpluses it is a national calamity and unbelievable; but, Mr. Speaker, here are the figures:

FARM EXPORTS FELL BELOW 1958 IMPORTS

In a reversal of form, the United States imported more agricultural products during the year ending July 31 than it exported.

In the previous 12-month period, the exports exceeded the imports.

Preliminary figures put exports during the year at \$3,720,450,000 in value and imports at \$4,005,258,000. In the preceding year, the exports were \$4,001,820,000 and the imports \$3,929,422,000.

Agriculture Department officials said the decline in foreign sales during the past year largely reflected a sharp drop in cotton sales. U.S. cotton prices were above world levels.

An upsurge in exports is expected during the 12-month period ending next July 1, largely on the basis that cotton has been returned to a competitive price basis in world markets.

Death Took a Holiday—in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD F. MCGINLEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. MCGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Ralph G. Brooks of the State of Nebraska and the Nebraska Safety Patrol have shown the Nation that highway death does not have to go unchecked.

Governor Brooks, with the cooperation of the patrol which worked many extra hours, made an all-out drive over the Labor Day weekend to see just what could be accomplished through this kind of effort.

The result is history. Nebraska recorded one traffic death—that a pedestrian fatality in a city.

I have sent the following telegram to Governor Brooks:

Your faith in the belief that something can be done about traffic accidents and fatalities is graphically proven by Nebraska's Labor Day weekend traffic record. You, Col. C. J. Sanders and his men of the Nebraska Safety Patrol saved lives during this time just as surely as if you had been skilled surgeons at work in a hospital. This will not end suffering or sorrow from highway tragedies in the future, but it is a firm reminder to every public official that he would be remiss in his duties at whatever level of government if he did not study every possibility as to government's place in traffic safety.

The story of this shining hour in Nebraska's history, and of the work of the men who made it possible is well described in the news story which I wish to insert at this point:

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, Sept. 9, 1959]

While the rest of the Nation struggled through a Labor Day weekend shrouded with traffic deaths, Nebraska apparently found a temporary answer to the problem.

Spearheaded by Gov. Ralph G. Brooks, who personally took part in patrol duty and issued two warning tickets, the Nebraska Safety Patrol under Col. C. J. Sanders staged one of its toughest crackdowns in its history.

The Governor, his aide Robert Conrad and Col. Sanders personally manned at times the two National Guard helicopters pressed into service.

The result of the enforcement crackdown showed in the statistic book.

Not a single highway fatality was recorded during the 3-day weekend. The only death to mar the record was a pedestrian in the city of Lincoln, making Nebraska's record one of the five best in the Nation.

The 1959 Labor Day holiday was the State's best record since 1936 when there were no fatalities recorded. For each of the intervening years there have been between two and seven fatalities on the Labor Day weekend.

Colonel Sanders pressed his 160 troopers plus patrol officers into cruiser duty. Even the criminal investigation division took to patrol cars. The troopers volunteered to extend their 10-hour regular shifts to 16-hour shifts.

Conrad, who heads the Governor's traffic safety committee, tabulated these results of the weekend's efforts:

The patrol arrested 1,075 motorists, of whom 37 were drunken drivers taken off the road; 2,317 were ticketed for vehicular defects, and 1,532 were issued warning tickets.

The total number of contacts were 4,924 for an average of 1,641 for each of the 3 days, compared with an average of 476 contacts per day for the patrol during the first 7 months of this year.

The longer shifts were the equivalent of 96 additional troopers patrolling the highways in addition to the 4 airplanes and 2 helicopters.

The troopers burned a train tank car of gasoline and drove an equivalent to six times around the world during the 3 days.

Governor Brooks, Colonel Sanders, and Conrad personally kicked off the crackdown by heading the dawn patrol Saturday morning.

Governor Brooks commented Tuesday that "this is not a record of which we can be proud but it is a record for which the entire State can rejoice."

Schedule of Meetings in the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Congressman should be in his district to confer and visit with his constituents whenever official duties do not require him to be in Washington.

When Congress adjourns in a few days, I expect to return to my district and to be available for conferences and visits with residents of the Fifth District in the courthouse of each county seat between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m., in accordance with the following schedule:

October 1, Van Wert County, Van Wert.

October 2, Defiance County, Defiance.

October 3, Ottawa County, Port Clinton—until noon.

October 5, Paulding County, Paulding.

October 6, Williams County, Bryan.

October 7, Putnam County, Ottawa.

October 8, Henry County, Napoleon.

October 9, Fulton County, Wauseon.

October 10, Wood County, Bowling Green—until noon.

No appointments will be necessary. All problems which constituents have with the Federal Government will be proper subjects for discussion.

Until Congress reconvenes in January, I will be available for conferences with constituents by appointment in my district office at 304 Wood County Bank Building, Bowling Green, Ohio, except on the days scheduled above.

Maine Needs and Must Develop Low-Cost Power for Industrial Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, next month, a decision may be made which can determine to a large extent the future prosperity of the State of Maine and, indeed, the industrial future of the New England States.

I refer to the forthcoming report of the Engineering and Fisheries Boards of the International Joint Commission on the great Passamaquoddy tidal power project.

There have been indications that the current engineering investigations being carried on by the U.S. Army Engineer division of New England and other agencies of the United States and Canadian Governments will result in a concrete proposal for construction of the Passamaquoddy project. A two-pool project using Passamaquoddy Bay and Cobscook Bay for water storage already has been selected for detailed design. A companion project at Rankin Rapids on the upper St. John River also has been suggested as part of the most promising and economical combined project by Brig. Gen. Alden K. Sibley of the U.S. Army Engineer division in New England.

If the October report finds Passamaquoddy feasible as a power project, Maine can look forward to the possible injection of many kilowatts of low-cost power into the State's lagging economy.

Waterpower was the basis for Maine's early industrial development. Lacking in coal, oil, or other fuels, Maine developed her industry—primarily woolen and cotton milling—early in the 19th century, with the mills located on the State's rushing streams.

So rich was our State in waterpower that an 1869 power study estimated the total energy discharged annually by the rivers of Maine as equal to the work of 34 million men working without interruption for 1 year. Many of our early leaders saw in the "white coal" of rushing water the key to a great industrial development.

But what happened?

As other regions began to develop industry, Maine lagged behind. Like other New England States, Maine has "enjoyed" some of the highest electric rates

in the Nation. The rivers, for the most part, went right on flowing to the sea.

Today, our State has an estimated 1,262,600 kilowatts of undeveloped hydroelectric power in its rivers, as compared to only 500,211 kilowatts of developed hydro, according to the latest available Federal Power Commission estimate. This does not take into account the tremendous potential of 'Quoddy itself.

Many reasons could be advanced for this lag, and many have. For example, it has been said that the rugged individualism of Maine people prevented any Federal development, and that there was no market for power from 'Quoddy or any other major project, and that industry does not concern itself greatly with the cost of electric power.

I will concede at once that Maine people are independent; but a greater factor, I believe, than personal antagonism to Federal development has been the bitter opposition of private utilities, clinging to a high-cost, low-use concept of electric service.

As for the lack of market for the power, the same argument was used when Muscle Shoals in Alabama and Grand Coulee in Washington State were proposed. In both of these cases, what actually happened was that abundance of power stimulated vast industrial developments which led to greater and greater demands for power and ultimately to the great power systems of the Tennessee Valley Authority and of the Bonneville Power Administration.

There is no reason to believe that 'Quoddy cannot be the Muscle Shoals of Maine and launch a similar rebirth of industry, progress, and better living standards for our people.

The third argument—that power costs are not important to industry—can be advanced in the case of some industries. But with increasing automation it becomes apparent that electric power is an ever-growing factor in most industries. Further, there are many modern industries which locate only where large quantities of low-cost power are available. Needless to say, these have not chosen Maine.

Our State produces 25 percent of the feldspar used in the United States, but exports it to four other States for the manufacture of porcelain and pottery. Aroostook County has one of the largest deposits of low-grade manganese ore in North America. An even more challenging prospect is open to Maine—the vast Labrador iron ore deposits which some day may replace the ore of the Mesabi Range of the Middle West as the major source of America's steel.

The possibility that Eastport's excellent harbor can be used for shipping the raw materials and products of great new steel mills in the vicinity of a Quoddy power project is no idle dream. It makes economic sense. It can happen, if we can only provide the energy to process the raw materials at a competitive cost.

Not long ago the Governor of Washington State reviewed the changes which have come to his State as a result of hydroelectric power development by the Federal Government. The parallel be-

tween that great northwest State and our State of Maine is very close. In the early 1930's, the Governor said, Washington's economy was based primarily on agriculture, logging, wood products manufacturing, and mining. Agriculture and logging similarly are basic industries in Maine.

Today, after the development of only a portion of Washington's hydro resources, new industries have grown up in Washington, the population has increased rapidly, and its people enjoy a high degree of electrical living. Aluminum aircraft and defense establishments have brought their payrolls to Washington State. Its people use more than 2½ times as much electricity as the average American family, enjoying many more electric servants than the average Maine family.

The Governor of Washington declared that during a recent trip east to talk with industrialists about locating in Washington—

I was greatly impressed by the value of low-cost power to industry. * * * At a series of meetings with industrialists in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, we presented information on the industrial advantages of our State. The point evoking the greatest comment and even surprise among the industrial leaders was the abundance and low cost of our electric power in Washington State.

Before TVA, there was a saying in Tennessee that the average farmer woke to the clang of a Connecticut alarm clock, climbed out of his Baltimore bed and into a pair of Oshkosh overalls and Sheboygan shoes and Chicago shirt. He washed his face and hands in a Pittsburgh pan, using Cincinnati soap, and dried on a Trenton towel, sat down in a Chillicothe chair to a Patterson plate, filled with St. Joe grits fried in Kansas City lard. After breakfast he put a New Bedford bridle on a Missouri mule, hitched him to a Peoria plow and, using Yankee cuss words, planted Columbus corn to satisfy a Massachusetts mortgage.

With certain variations in the menu, much the same story could be told of many farmers in my State of Maine today.

TVA has brought many changes to the valley it serves. Laboratories and factories have grown up in its industrial centers, the march of erosion has been halted, a reforestation program has renewed a once faltering lumber industry. Flocks of tourists pour into the valley to enjoy the man-made lakes, commerce moves along the inland waterways, valuable land along the rivers can be used without fear of major floods.

Will this story be told of New England 20 years from now? It is up to us.

Today, families in the New England States pay the highest average monthly electric bills in the Nation. Consider these averages for 250 kilowatt-hours of service, published in FPC's latest edition of "Typical Residential Electric Bills": New Hampshire, highest in the Nation, \$8.92.

Massachusetts, second highest, \$8.91.

Vermont, third highest, \$8.90.

Rhode Island, fourth highest, \$8.74.

Maine, sixth highest, \$8.51.

Connecticut, twelfth highest, \$8.

At the other end of the scale, consider families living in the states enjoying a high degree of Federal hydroelectric development:

Washington, lowest in the Nation, \$4.53.

Tennessee, second lowest, \$4.84.

Oregon, third lowest, \$5.40.

Alabama, fourth lowest, \$5.42.

Perhaps the difference of \$4 a month—close to \$50 a year—is not of vital importance now to the average family. As the use of electric servants grows, however, this electric bill will become an increasingly important part of the family budget.

From industry's standpoint, power costs can be of real significance. As an example, take the private utilities serving in Maine and in upstate New York, where hydroelectric power has been developed on a large scale. An industry in Bangor, Maine, using 400,000 kilowatt-hours would pay \$6,275 per month for electricity, while an industry in Niagara Falls, N.Y., would pay only \$3,391 per month for the same service, according to the latest FPC figures.

These thousands of dollars could make the difference between profit and loss to many industries.

Some years ago, in 1951, the Committee on the New England Economy of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, headed by economist Leon H. Keyserling, prepared a detailed report on the New England economy which mapped the route the area could take to achieve lasting prosperity.

New England has many problems—

The report said—

but if there is one that stands out it is how to make the most of its resources, its human resources including its resources in ideas as well as its natural resources, and to facilitate the adaptation of its industrial structure to changes in its underlying competitive position.

'Quoddy is one of the most challenging ideas which Maine's human resources have come up with in many generations, just as the power of the tides is one of the State's great natural resources. We can develop both.

At another point, the report declares:

We are concerned over the failure of utilities in this (New England) area to seek larger use of power through more venturesome pricing policies. . . . In some other regions, the presence of public power has tended to force private utilities to be more venturesome in their rate policies. The use of electric power has been thereby stimulated greatly without any loss to the utilities.

In short, the injection of public power from 'Quoddy into the high-power-cost economy of Maine can stimulate a new approach on the part of the utilities. As has been shown in the TVA area and in the Northwest, low rates and the aggressive promotion of widespread power use can bring new industry a higher standard of living, and a handsome rate of return to existing utilities all in one package.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The New England Economy," a report to the President, transmitting a study initiated by the Council of Economic Ad-

visers and prepared by its Committee on the New England Economy, July 1951—Superintendent of Documents.

"Passamaquoddy Tidal Power: A New Source of Energy," address by Brig. Gen. Alden K. Sibley, U.S. Army Engineer Division, New England Corps of Engineers, Boston, Mass.

"The Power Policy of Maine," by Lincoln Smith, University of California Press, Berkeley, Calif., 1951.

Speech, "Progress Through Low Cost Power," by Hon. Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of Washington, to American Public Power Association, Seattle, Wash., May 27, 1959.

FPC publications: "Typical Residential Electric Bills: Cities of 2,500 and More," and "Typical Electric Bills, Residential, Commercial, and Industrial."

Report to My Constituents on the 86th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, while the record of the Congress as a whole cannot be fully analyzed until the second session draws to a close next year, we have grappled with many problems during this first session and have seen some very noteworthy achievements take place. At this time I would like to summarize briefly some of the accomplishments as a report to my constituents.

This session will perhaps be best remembered for its passage of a strong labor reform bill. After almost 2 years of extensive investigations and exposures by the McClellan committee in the Senate, an aroused public demanded that Congress take action on legislation to cope with unscrupulous activities in the labor-management field. The result was the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House and Senate by an overwhelming majority. The first major labor legislation since the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, this measure, signed by President Eisenhower, is prouder and propitious. It is not an antilabor bill. It guarantees many basic rights to labor-union members. Among these are equal rights to union members in the conduct of union affairs, protection against arbitrary dues increases, protection of the right to sue, free and fair union elections, safeguards against improper disciplinary action, and protection of union funds. The bill's strong ban on secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing protect the public against abuse of union monopoly powers and the provision giving State labor boards jurisdiction over disputes now refused by the National Labor Relations Board will strengthen the hand of small business in labor disputes.

When the 86th Congress convened last January, with the Democrats holding a majority of almost 2 to 1 in both the House and Senate, the trend seemed to indicate that this would be the spend-

ingest Congress in history. Bills estimating a 5-year price tag of \$117 billion were introduced in the first few weeks. It took the President several vetoes to make his point that if Congress wanted to spend more money on additional projects, it would have to raise taxes to pay for them or face the twin consequences of deficit spending and continuing inflation. By the end of the session, action or inaction by the spenders had pushed the budget figure up to nearly \$79 billion from \$77.1 billion submitted by the President. While they trimmed regular appropriations requests, they boosted authorizations for future spending, some of it by the back-door route which bypasses the regular appropriations committees. The so-called decreases do not cover, for example, \$231 million in authorization for back-door spending not sought by the President. Fortunately, however, with the strong hand of President Eisenhower, together with the public's demand for economy, we were able to hold some of the line at least on spending. There is a chance that a balanced budget, as sought by the President, may yet be achieved before the close of the fiscal year because of revenue increases. This would indeed be a truly noteworthy achievement for the fiscal integrity of the Nation.

Of major importance to Ohio was the passage of legislation making it possible to continue the Federal aid highway program. In 1956, in response to popular demand, Congress approved the construction of a 41,000-mile system of interstate highways designed to bring highways up to acceptable standards by 1972. To finance the program Congress established a highway trust fund in which are deposited the proceeds of the Federal gasoline taxes, and certain excise taxes. At the time the highway program was adopted, it was estimated that the \$25 billion to be raised for the highway trust fund would complete the system. However, in April 1958, as an antirecession measure, Congress passed an accelerated highway building program but did not provide the necessary means for financing. As a result of this action, the highway trust fund faced a deficit of \$1.3 billion by July 1961 if existing commitments to the States were met. To meet this deficit and keep the program on a fiscally sound basis President Eisenhower proposed that the gasoline tax be increased by 1½ cents a gallon. After a delay of many months the Committees on Public Works and Ways and Means finally worked out a compromise calling for a 1-cent per gallon increase over a 22-month period. As a result of this action, Ohio and other States will be able to continue their highway building program without any major curtailment.

Once again this year it was necessary for Ohio Members to appear before the Public Works Committee to oppose the Lake Michigan diversion bill. This bill, if enacted, would permit Chicago to divert more water from Lake Michigan thereby causing a lowering of the level of all the Great Lakes. In spite of a valiant floor fight by Ohio and other Great Lakes congressional delegations,

the bill passed the House. However, because of the increased opposition of Canada, when the bill reached the Senate floor, it was killed for the time being by a vote to refer it to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

After three tries the Congress finally passed a housing bill acceptable to President Eisenhower. The President had found it necessary to veto the first two bills because of their inflationary aspects, and also because they contained provisions which he felt had no place in a housing bill, such as loans for the construction of college classrooms. The bill finally enacted provided sufficient FHA housing insurance authority to provide for early 1960 construction planning, a 2-year, \$650 million urban renewal program, authorization for 37,000 public housing units, and \$50 million in direct loans for housing for the elderly.

For our veterans, the Congress passed a bill making a major overhaul in the system used to determine pensions payable to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities and to their widows and children. The new bill provides a sliding scale of monthly pensions based on the needs of the veterans. Under this measure no veteran now on the rolls will have his pension reduced or taken away; however, if he qualifies for a higher pension under the bill he can elect to come under its provisions. Generally, the bill will provide higher pension rates than those now applicable.

In the field of foreign affairs, we sat many weeks in the committee on the mutual security bill. The legislation which finally emerged from the House-Senate conference provided for an authorization of \$3,556,200,000 for the fiscal year 1960—a reduction of \$353 million from the President's recommendations. The Appropriations Committee, which provides the funds, further reduced the amount to \$3,225,813,000—some \$704 million less than the administration had requested.

In the Foreign Affairs Committee we added a new section to the Mutual Security Act calling upon the Secretary of State to set up an Office of Inspector General and Comptroller to enforce fiscal responsibility in any and all mutual security programs.

Another matter of vital concern to the committee was legislation dealing with standards for the issuance of passports. On June 16, 1958, the Supreme Court ruled that the regulations of the Secretary of State denying passports to supporters of the world Communist movement were invalid because of a lack of specific legislative authority. The President on July 7, 1958, requested the Congress to enact legislation granting authority necessary to deal with this matter. The bill which finally passed the House this session authorizes the Secretary of State to deny passports to or revoke passports of persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement. Such denial or revocation is made contingent upon a finding by the Secretary that the activities or presence abroad of such persons would be harmful to the security of the United States, and any

denial or revocation of a passport under this authority is made subject to judicial review.

A great historical achievement of this session was the passage of statehood for Hawaii. The 99th and 100th Senators were seated as well as an additional Member of the House. Now, for the first time in 160 years, there is no Territorial Delegate serving in the House.

As an interesting finale to the long, long session, I went with my subcommittee chairman, the Honorable WAYNE HAYS—Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations—to Moscow. Primarily we went to see the U.S. fair, to see for ourselves the standards set and upheld and to evaluate somewhat its effectiveness. It would be difficult to imagine any combined effort of Government, private industry, and the whole personnel group which could have done a better job. The eagerness of the visitors told the story. The hunger, on the faces of those in the book exhibit especially, in the area where they could pick up and read magazines and books somehow made the whole effort, which was a tremendous one, more than worthwhile. Mr. Harold C. McClellan and all those associated with him, young and old, in and out of Government and industry, deserve their country's grateful thanks.

The 1st session of the 86th Congress is over at last. Since the adjournment came, as you know, at 6:21 a.m., after a long, long night. Now we have half of September, all of October, November, and December before we come back, on January 6. May we use the time well wherever the days find us.

Letter to Mr. Clyde Ellis, General Manager of the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include copy of a letter I have today directed to the Honorable Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. The letter, is self-explanatory and deserves the attention of every Member of Congress.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1959.

Mr. CLYDE ELLIS,
General Manager, National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: This letter is being written to you in the spirit of fair play and mutual understanding which should be manifest between your organization and the Members of Congress on strictly a nonpartisan basis if the best interest of REA, RTA, and the country as a whole are to be served.

As you well know, the rural electrification program and the expanding program as assistance in the improvement of rural telephone communications have always been

the accomplishment of bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress. Democrats and Republicans have joined in advancing these programs and in voting adequate funds for their development. Under Administrators selected both by Democratic and Republican Chief Executives, the programs have prospered and expanded. The statistics clearly demonstrate that the present REA Administrator, David Hamill, for example, has given efficient and sympathetic direction to the REA and RTA programs.

Under Mr. Hamill's administration, processing of loans has been expedited; collections from borrowers have an enviable record; adequate loan funds have been kept available. In the main, relationships between REA and RTA and Members of Congress have historically been friendly and productive regardless of partisanship. It is my conviction—and I hope yours—that they should be kept that way.

I give you this brief review, Mr. Ellis, of facts with which you are, of course, familiar simply to demonstrate the importance of keeping REA and RTA out of politics and free from the sharp repercussions of partisan campaigning which should have no place in worthy programs of this type.

I mention the foregoing because of rumors reaching me that the organization which you head and which draws its support from user-sponsored cooperatives is about to "enter the field of active partisan politics." I am sure this would be a most regrettable development.

On occasion reports have reached me of speeches you have yourself given before REA and RTA groups and annual meetings or of your public writings which carry a slanted political tinge. That, in itself, is most regrettable. I have also heard that some of your associates in the field have similarly shown an increasing tendency to move in the direction of injecting political discussions and considerations into their activities. Complaints of this type continue to reach my office, both from Congressmen who feel aggrieved over an attempt to use REA and RTA for political axe grinding and from REA subscribers who resent it.

Recently, it has been reported you propose to "loan" some of your employees to Democratic candidates for Congress to serve as campaign counselors or managers with the understanding they will be reemployed by you after the elections are over. I am not clear on whose payroll they would serve but assuming they would be taken off your salary lists while so serving such a temporary severance of connection with your office would not divorce them from the serious implications involved. Such a practice would be tantamount, of course, to putting your organization directly into political activity and do serious injury to the productive and effective cooperative support of REA and RTA which has meant so much to this movement in the past and is so necessary to its future development.

As chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, my responsibility is of course to support Republican candidates for office. All I ask for those I support is the consistent practice of fair play and the proper public identification of all political functionaries involved. Naturally, I do not want your organization or any other nonpolitical group supporting the Democratic candidates as a matter of partisan philosophy or to promote the personal political fortunes of anyone so long as it enjoys the reputation, tax advantages, and safeguards of being a nonprofit and nonpolitical organization. That is simply asking for fair play. To engage in the type of practices mentioned in this communication would, I am sure you must agree, necessitate your forfeiting the position of being a nonpolitical and nonpartisan service organization.

It is for this reason I am writing you this frank and earnest letter. I sincerely hope my reports are inaccurate but they seem sufficiently well founded to warrant this letter which I shall insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to which I hope you can give me a categorical reply which I shall also be happy to incorporate in the RECORD. I hope your reply will contain complete assurances that I have been falsely informed and that you are not going to besmirch the concept of your organization by making it and its employees and associates the handmaiden or tool of either political party.

Sincerely yours,

The Importance of Followthrough on the International Public Health and Medical Research Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Wednesday, September 9, the Senate soundly approved, by unanimous consent, Senate Resolution 129, 86th Congress, for the observance of an International Public Health and Medical Research Year.

This action was, I believe, of deep international significance. It reasserts American leadership in medicine and medical research.

It is an action consistent with the outstanding record of the U.S. Senate in spearheading advances in international health.

The action is a source of pride to me not simply as author of Senate Resolution 129, but as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and as chairman of the Senate's current international health study, as conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

PLAN NOW FOR A SOUND BASIS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL HEALTH YEAR

Certain facts should be clearly understood with regard to the proposed International Health Year.

A brief history of this project was previously presented in comments which I made in the Senate on June 5, 1959. At that time, beginning on page 8993, I traced the origins of the legislation.

I pointed out how the Senate, in August 1958, in the closing days of the 85th Congress, had unanimously approved Senate Resolution 361, which I had introduced for this purpose.

That resolution represented the first formal expression by any parliamentary or executive body anywhere in the world on this subject of what I call IHY—the International Health Year.

Senate Resolution 361 established unmistakably the U.S. origin of the concept.

Thereafter, in December 1958, at the initiative of the Soviet Ukraine—which is, incidentally, an inactive nonpaying member of the World Health Organization—the United Nations General As-

sembly—with U.S. support—approved the concept of the International Health Year. The U.N. General Assembly commended it to the World Health Organization.

Subsequently, at its 12th General Assembly, in May 1959, World Health Organization, while expressing deep appreciation and satisfaction in the concept of the year and while appreciating the value and importance of the year, stated that it found it necessary to postpone any action on plans for the possible year, for the present. WHO stated however, that it would take the issue up again in the World Health Assembly, convening in May 1960.

PURPOSE OF NEW RESOLUTION

The present Senate resolution is, therefore, designed to maintain the constructive momentum. It seeks to use the time period between September 1959 and May 1960 for the most constructive work possible.

Senate Resolution 129 envisions that the President of the United States will now take the lead. He will through his appropriate advisers help lay the basis for detailed planning of possible projects under the year.

By whom will this initial planning be done? By the expert Federal agencies most directly concerned with this subject, notably the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Science Foundation. Of assistance as well will be the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, which played so indispensable a role in the precedent for the International Health Year—the International Geophysical Year.

VITAL ROLE OF MEDICAL PROFESSION

But just as important, and indeed far more important than the role of official agencies, will be the role of private sources.

No single private source is more important than the medical community of the United States as ably represented through the American Medical Association. In addition, outstanding organizations such as the World Medical Association and specialized medical organizations such as the various academies and colleges concerned with particular medical fields will play a vital role. So, too, will the Nation's medical schools.

TWOFOLD CATEGORIES OF PROJECTS

To find the right type of projects which the United States might formally and informally recommend is a real challenge.

We must remember that the very title of the year indicates its twofold nature: (a) International Public Health and (b) Medical Research.

Category (a) indicates improved service—assistance—care-type programs.

Category (b) indicates programs aimed at new discovery.

In turn, the projects under both categories must be thought through very carefully.

THREE TYPES OF CHALLENGES TO UNITED STATES

Here, as I see it, are three types of projects:

First. Independent U.S. projects for our own people.

Second. U.S. and international collaborative projects which will concern many people.

Third. Independent foreign projects on behalf of the needs in individual foreign nations.

In other words, the International Health Year is an opportunity to raise our targets.

Targets for whom?

First. For ourselves, as one nation.

Second. For all peoples, across the board.

Third. For other individual nations and regions.

Obviously therefore, all other nations will similarly have to think through what they propose to do and can do for themselves and/or for others.

AMERICA'S PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY

But as the leading power, no nation faces greater responsibilities or greater opportunities than ourselves.

No nation can do, has done or will do more in both public health and in medical research than ourselves.

The United States, of course, is but one of the member nations of the World Health Organization. It is not for us to attempt to tell World Health Organization what it should do. We have never presumed to do so. Rather, consistent with our past record in World Health Organization, we would simply submit to it the very best judgment which we could make available and seek to secure favorable action by the majority and if possible, all members.

THE BASIC WHO DECISIONS

So, would the other nations do likewise, WHO, would thereafter, through its able Director-General, Dr. M. G. Candau, through its executive committee and through its general assembly, decide (a) what is feasible, (b) what is desirable, (c) what is necessary, and (d) and how, when, where, and with what resources.

Let it be noted that the International Health Year will cost money. How much money will depend upon the projects to be decided upon, their nature and their scope. Neither Senate Resolution 361 of the 85th Congress, nor Senate Resolution 129 of the 86th Congress, specifically provides money.

But I am certain that when the time comes, the money will be forthcoming. It has been forthcoming for the International Refugee Year. It was generously and rightly made available for the International Geophysical Year.

NO CURE-ALL TO WORLD PROBLEMS

Here, however, let it be noted that the International Health Year is not purported to be the cure-all to the world's medical problems.

It is simply a means by which we can break through to higher levels of attack against those problems. It is a means by which we can raise the visibility of the people of the United States and the peoples of the world to the nature of health needs and resources.

Most major health problems, by their very nature, cannot be solved in a 12-month period, or an 18-month period, or

even perhaps a decade or a quarter century. But that is no reason why we should not start or proceed ahead.

The value of an intensive period of collaboration has long since been proven, notably in the International Geophysical Year.

Research, in particular, never offers a guarantee of success. No one can devise a timetable for future discoveries. The problems of cancer for example, may be solved in 1960 or in 1970 or still later. No one can be sure.

Nor can the world's shortage of doctors, nurses, and other specialists be solved overnight. Training takes time, long years.

But the time to begin is at hand.

CARRY ON EXISTING PROGRAMS

Here, too, a further fact should be noted. Nothing would be more contrary to the spirit of the International Health Year than to lag in present health programs.

In other words, we have a health job to do right now—in 1959, 1960, 1961, and in the period thereafter. We must provide every possible nickel which we can for these purposes. We must not hold back one iota, simply waiting for the International Health Year to commence in 1963 or 1964.

I point this out because the World Health Organization currently does not have sufficient financial resources to move ahead on one of its own great projects, namely: the worldwide malaria eradication program. As Dr. M. G. Candau has pointed out: Antimalaria funds must be provided right now if the present campaign is to be prosecuted to a victorious conclusion. Let us not, therefore, in preoccupation with what might be done in 1963 or 1964, forget what we must do right now.

IMPORTANCE OF HILL-FOGARTY LEGISLATION

As for U.S. congressional action, starting next January, we must not delay at all in the second session of the 86th Congress in moving ahead on international health legislation.

No single step would be more important than House approval of Hill-Fogarty legislation to create a National Institute for International Medical Research. The great coauthors, Alabama's distinguished senior Senator, LISTER HILL, and Rhode Island's devoted Representative, JOHN FOGARTY, are the leading builders of what could become the most important single institution for the International Health Year or any year.

The International Institute is not just necessary, it is indispensable. No one has more eloquently proved the case for it than its tireless champion, LISTER HILL.

TRIBUTE TO HEW DEPARTMENT

Meanwhile, fortunately, the International Health Year has been the subject of very careful consideration by outstanding authorities.

In May 1959 there was held here in the city of Washington a conference of the National Citizen's Committee for the World Health Organization. That conference heard a splendid address by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur Flemming. Dr. Flemming

stated his enthusiasm for the concept of the year and his words were a source of inspiration to all present.

Secretary Flemming's comments were faithfully implemented in the World Health Assembly which started shortly thereafter in Geneva. No single individual contributed more to the effort of implementation than the able Surgeon General of the U. S. Public Health Service, Dr. Leroy Burney. I wish to pay tribute to Dr. Burney and to his special assistant for international affairs, Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, for the splendid contributions which they have made in this as in other respects.

I want to state, too, that outstanding in the careful consideration of this matter has been America's most foremost medical research leader, Dr. James Shannon, Director of the National Institutes of Health.

ROLE ON INTERNATIONAL HEALTH SUBCOMMITTEE

I am pleased to report that the International Health Study which is being conducted by the Senate Committee on Government Operations has been in continuous contact with these leaders and with this entire project. Indeed, I believe it is safe to say that no single source, in or out of Congress, has initiated, or has received more contacts, not only here in the United States but throughout the world, concerning the International Health Year than has this subcommittee.

For the health year, we must not set our sights either too high or too low. We must attempt to do the possible, but must not shrink from attempting new, bold, and imaginative programs.

DR. GUNDERSEN'S SOUND COMMENTS

A welcome cue for our role has come from the American Medical Association, to which I earlier referred. I should like to point out that the distinguished past president of the American Medical Association, Dr. Gunnar Gundersen has urged that great body to offer leadership and maximum help to the proposed International Health Year.

As reported in the December 15, 1959, issue of the AMA News, Dr. Gundersen said that the health year would give medicine a chance to offer imagination on the international scene and make a contribution to world understanding.

Speaking at the opening of the 12th clinical meeting of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association, Dr. Gundersen declared that "the time has passed for policies based on generalities, platitudes, and flagwaving." He then suggested that the association offer support and cooperation to proposals for the International Medical Year.

So, too, we look to the Nation's leaders in other life sciences—to biology and chemistry for example—for maximum contributions.

That is why I wanted to see Senate Resolution 129 enacted. What it does is flash a "green light" to the President of the United States and to the people of the United States.

It says: "Please proceed ahead. Please hold the necessary conferences and assemblies, so that the broadest thinking,

the best thinking which can be mobilized is made available."

EVERYONE MUST DO HIS PART

Who should be represented in these conferences and assemblies?

Everyone who can make a constructive contribution. Doctors and laymen, civic leaders and scientific leaders. There is room for all. There is opportunity for all. Let each do what he can. That includes, for example, the voluntary health agencies and the other great organizations which represent millions of Americans in all walks of life.

The International Health Year will be a success if all of us help make it a success. Where? Right in our own backyards, so to speak, as well as throughout the world.

My words include the Congress. They include the executive branch. I include great leaders like Dr. Detlev Bronk of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council. I include labor and business and agriculture, women's organizations, veterans' groups, and professional organizations.

May I respectfully extend, therefore, this invitation to them. I extend it to the fine National Health Council and the American Public Health Association—which convenes next month in Atlantic City.

I extend the invitation especially to those who guard the Nation's health—our physicians to whom we look for continued guidance.

Let International Health Year meetings be held. Let problems and projects be explored. Let us get on with the task of the advance work.

I invite now the comments and reactions of the American public. They may wish to obtain copies of this legislation, together with a reprint of my June 5, 1959, comments and of a splendid article on the health year which was published in the May 29, 1959, issue of Science magazine, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

I include now, an editorial from the May 12, 1959, issue of the New York Times which was published on the day of the opening of the 12th World Health Assembly in Geneva. This editorial rightly stressed the concept of continuity in health advances.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD HEALTH PLANNING

Another conference is opening in Geneva today. It will not be controversial, except as its members try to find ways to do a good job better. This is the annual Assembly of the World Health Organization, and its 12th meeting.

The function of this Assembly is to examine the proposals for the organization's operations next year. High on the list is the continuing fight against communicable and preventable disease. The gains made thus far are encouraging and this is the time to give fresh impetus to the various campaigns.

Part of this impetus should come from the plan to make 1961 an international "year" for medical research and its support. Appropriate legislation is before our Congress to further this plan. But in the minds of all

those who are concerned with world health planning is the larger concept of more than a "year." It can be a decade or half a century. The very existence of a World Health Organization has shown us there can be no narrow geographical limits in this field. There are also no time limits. The good fight must be waged until the last battle is won.

The Labor-Management Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I voted for the Kennedy-Ervin bill when it passed the Senate, and I also voted for the conference report when it came to the Senate. I have been criticized for my vote by a district president of the UMWA in West Virginia, and I have received from his office a resolution of condemnation, to which I have today responded by letter. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution and a press article carrying the labor leader's attack upon the two West Virginia Senators, published in the Beckley (W. Va.) Post-Herald, on September 10, 1959. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letter of reply to the resolution of condemnation.

There being no objection, the resolution, article, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas during the past several years in the National Congress, a group known as the Senate Labor Rackets Committee has been developing a pattern of approach designed to destroy the organized labor movement and reduce the men and women who toil to chattel slaves. It accomplished its work well in providing a forum of discussion and dissemination to the public of a garbled and distorted picture of union labor. Whenever and wherever possible this committee worked in the atmosphere of the savage passions of Washington politics and the irreconcilable conflict of personal conscience and personal ambition; and

Whereas the hour of decision came to the Congress within the past few days when against the pleading of House Speaker RAYBURN, a coalition of southern Democrats and reactionary Republicans were successful in passing the Landrum-Griffin bill—the most stringent of the three before the honorable body—a bill designed by the malefactors of great wealth and the disciples of entrenched greed to take the laboring masses back down that long road when we were nothing more than outcasts deprived of performing any meaningful function in our communities, denied the basic necessities of life including adequate health care and unable to maintain the minimum standards of decency this social stagnation made living a thing to be deplored; and

Whereas in the last political campaign we were confronted with political chameleons—lizards that change color of their skin—who uttered praise and platitudes for the greatest labor organization in all the world—the United Mine Workers of America—and swore allegiance to the cause we collectively espouse. In these allegations they gave only lipservice and we submit that to this date they have not performed one single act that may be considered constructive in performing the task they purported to perform—the

slogan on their campaign posters was "Build West Virginia With RANDOLPH and BYRD."

Whereas this stab in the back will, if not taken lightly, perform a great service for our people—it will cause them to come to the realization that a politician cannot be trusted when the chips are down; it will awake in them the graveness of the situation and cause them to realize anew that their only hope is in the power and influence of our great organization and our great leader, John L. Lewis, who has tolled always with unyielding courage and persistence in their best interest. In the discharge of his duties, Mr. Lewis in his high office, has with fairness of appraisal, poise amid confusion, a kindly heart, a nobility of goodness, and the simple faith in men that all great leaders possess continued to give much of himself to make the road smoother, the trip more rewarding as we have journeyed down through the years and continue into the uncertain tomorrow; and

Whereas this good man made an appeal through our legislative agent, Bob Howe, to the several Representatives and Senators, to stand by their campaign promise and keep West Virginia building. For this only can be accomplished by keeping labor free in free America. Prior to this he appealed personally to our two Senators on behalf of the confirmation of Lewis Strauss. You know the answer as it is a matter of public record. Before Congress had barely convened in January they went contrary to our great leader on civil rights legislation. When the question arises as to what they thought is the best interests of our union—their hitting average is 100 percent against your wives and children and those yet unborn. For the far-reaching effects of this labor legislation will be here to plague us for many, many years to come if it follows the pattern of Taft-Hartley; and

Whereas during all this hour of betrayal three Representatives from West Virginia did not forget the men and women who sent them to Congress and will keep them there—Mrs. ELIZABETH KEE, Mr. HARLEY STAGGERS, and Mr. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY stood up and were counted on our side if you please. Through courage, honest devotion, and unsullied fighting spirit they proved their worth beyond question in this grave responsibility of their stewardship. Their integrity in office and faithfulness to trust has ever been their longing and aspiration—they covet and cultivate your friendship by deeds not words and promises; and

Whereas we believe that those who have been faithful to their trust should be rewarded—likewise our betrayers should receive our everlasting condemnation. We must have Representatives who realize that while their duties present a thorny and laborious problem, the reward of a task well done becomes progress toward the fulfillment of human destiny; therefore be it

Resolved, That Local Union 9375 of Tralee, W. Va., in regular meeting assembled, condemn the action of our Senators and Representatives in the National Congress who play footsie with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturers Association, and all other groups who prowl the streets and buildings in our Nation's Capital seeking to prevent the people who toil in America from having some of the better things of life, and commend for high honors, KEE, BAILEY, and STAGGERS; and be it further

Resolved, That we begin to plan now to eliminate from the lawmaking body those who stood against us in the supreme challenge and put our plans into action when we go to the polls in 1960.

Fraternally submitted.

This resolution was unanimously adopted at the District 29, United Mine Workers of America Labor Day celebration held at Pineville, W. Va., Monday, September 7, 1959.

The motion to adopt the resolution was made by Fred Wooten, Local Union 6026, Coalwood, W. Va., and was seconded by Ernest Moore, Local Union 7633, Thorpe, W. Va.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Post-Herald, Sept. 10, 1959]

TITLER BLASTS SENATORS FOR "STAB IN THE BACK"

West Virginia's two U.S. Senators, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of Elkins, and ROBERT C. BYRD, of Sophia, have been accused of "stabbing labor in the back" in a resolution already mailed to them and now being sent to every local union of the United Mine Workers of America in the State.

The resolution was adopted at the Labor Day celebration Monday in Pineville. George J. Titler, president of District 29, of the UMWA, repeated some of the charges made against RANDOLPH and BYRD in Pineville.

Titler said: "The labor unions and coal miners, especially in West Virginia, have been shocked and nauseated by the action of the so-called pro-labor BYRD and RANDOLPH in the 86th Congress.

"The first real stab in the back by RANDOLPH and BYRD, a stab at the coal miners of West Virginia, was when they allowed LYNDON JOHNSON to pull them around by the nose and get them to vote against Lewis Strauss when his confirmation came before the U.S. Senate for Secretary of Commerce.

"For 10 years we have been trying to get quotas on import of residual oil—and 2 months after Strauss succeeded in having this done the two Senators from West Virginia cut his throat from ear to ear. Their votes constituted the balance of power which rejected him.

"Their next two antilabor votes were for the Kennedy-Erwin bill and when they voted for the compromise Landrum-Griffin bill.

"In the last 10 years we have had three nasty thrusts of fascism in America. The first was the Taft-Hartley Act, the second the right-to-work laws in 19 States, and the third the Kennedy-Erwin and Landrum-Griffin bills."

The blunt resolution of protest came from UMWA Local 9375 at Tralee. It was unanimously adopted by those present for the celebration.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE TITLER,
President District 29, United Mine Workers
of America, Beckley, W. Va.

DEAR GEORGE: I have noted the Beckley Post-Herald story of September 10, captioned "Titler Blasts Senators for 'Stab in the Back.'" The article refers to a resolution adopted at the District 29 Labor Day celebration in Pineville on September 7, and states that the resolution is being mailed to Senator RANDOLPH and to me and every UMWA local union in the State.

I have received the resolution. It came to me in an envelope mailed from Beckley and bearing your return address. I have noted the condemnation of my action, and that of Senator RANDOLPH and Congressmen HECHLER, SLACK, and MOORE, in voting for the labor-management reform bill which recently passed both Houses of the Congress.

The resolution speaks of "political chameleons" who, in the last political campaign, "swore allegiance" to the cause which the United Mine Workers of America "collective espouse." May I say that those who prepared the resolution, and I assume you took part in its preparation, might do well to remember that I stated, time and again, during the last campaign, that I intended to vote for a labor-management reform bill. I made this statement to the people several times during my appearances on television and otherwise. No individual need have been under any false impression as to where I stood, because I felt at that time, as I

feel now, that the American people as a whole wanted and deserved some legislation to prevent, as much as possible, future corruption and racketeering in the labor-management field. The rank-and-file membership of many of our unions needed protection, and I am confident that many of the labor leaders themselves throughout the country realized that something had to be done.

The resolution goes on to state, in referring to the two West Virginia Senators, as follows:

"To this date they have not performed one single act that may be considered constructive in performing the task they purported to perform—the slogan on their campaign posters was 'build West Virginia With RANDOLPH and BYRD.'"

It is to be regretted that those who seek to criticize Senator RANDOLPH and me find it convenient to overlook the many efforts we have put forth in behalf of our State and our people. We have performed not "one single act" but many acts which should redound to the best interests of our constituency. What about the Coal Research and Development Act, which was cosponsored by the two West Virginia Senators? The efforts of Senator RANDOLPH and me in urging upon our leadership and upon the appropriate committee of the Senate that action be taken on this measure, were responsible in great measure for enactment of this legislation. What about the area redevelopment legislation which passed the Senate several months ago? Have those who criticize us today forgotten that my subcommittee held hearings in West Virginia on the need for such legislation and that Senator RANDOLPH appeared and gave testimony in its behalf? What about the Youth Conservation Corps Act? This bill, which Senator RANDOLPH and I joined in cosponsoring, passed the Senate, and its enactment into law would put many thousands of young men to work. What about the public works measures which have been made possible by the work of the West Virginia Senators on the Public Works Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee? These projects will put men to work at Summersville and Princeton and East Raintelle and at other places throughout the State. What about the appropriations made by my committee for armory construction in West Virginia? Ask our mutual friend, Congressman BAILEY, as to who was responsible for the inclusion of additional moneys for West Virginia in the military construction appropriation bill.

I could go on and on, if it were necessary, to recall the many accomplishments by the West Virginia delegation in the Congress, but I shall only touch now upon one other significant action by Senator RANDOLPH and me, inasmuch as you have been quoted in the press as alluding to the Strauss episode. You have criticized our vote in opposition to the confirmation of Lewis Strauss. You would have the rank-and-file membership of the UMWA believe that Mr. Strauss was solely responsible for the imposition of mandatory controls on imports of residual oil. You should have known that this is not the case. The voice of Mr. Strauss was only one voice, and who is there to say that his successor

will not favor mandatory import quotas? In bringing up the matter of mandatory import controls on residual oil, why do you not give credit where it belongs? In my 7 years in the Congress I have been waging this fight, as have others of the West Virginia delegation. Prior to the imposition of mandatory controls this year, your two West Virginia Senators and the West Virginia Members in the House of Representatives waged a determined campaign to have the President institute such controls. We went to Acting Secretary Strauss; we met with the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Mr. Leo Hoegh; we went to the Department of the Interior; we took our fight to the late Deputy Secretary of Defense, Donald Quarles; we went to Under Secretary Dillon in the Department of State; and Senator RANDOLPH and I climaxed our efforts by going direct to the President of the United States in the White House. We helped to fight the battles and carry the burden in the heat of the day, but your statement seeks to give Mr. Strauss the credit. Mr. Strauss has long since been gone from Government circles, but the import controls are continuing. Of course, I have no way of knowing how long they will remain in existence, because the New England area continues to bring considerable pressure on the President to get him to recede from his action. But the fact remains that your West Virginia Senators and your House Members were, in a very considerable measure, responsible for the import controls.

As for the unfortunate Mr. Strauss, the propaganda that was disseminated in his behalf backfired on him, and he is about as much to blame as is anyone for his own defeat. Some of the New England Senators were told that he helped to keep coal out of their States; conversely, the two West Virginia Senators were told that he was a friend of coal. So you can see that his supporters were working both ends against the middle. I voted against him because I did not feel that it was in the best interests of the country to have him confirmed, and I reached my decision after I had read the 1,128 pages of the hearings. I think I did the right thing, and I am willing to stand on my decision.

The resolution charges that the West Virginia Senators played "footsie with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and all other groups who prowl the streets and buildings in our Nation's Capital seeking to prevent the people who toil in America from having some of the better things of life * * *." Your two Senators have not played footsie with these groups or with any other groups. We simply do not wear anybody's collar around our necks.

The bill which passed the Congress will not hurt honest unions, and it will give added protection to the rank-and-file members in the unions. Honest union leaders have nothing to fear from the legislation. George, the flagrant disregard of the rights of the rank and file members of organized labor by men like Hoffa and Beck, and the corruption and racketeering that have been revealed in the fields of both labor and management, made it imperative that some kind

of legislation be enacted. The people of this country, and this includes thousands of individuals in the ranks of labor, were determined that legislation should be written to prevent such future abuses. I came up in a workingman's home, and my sentiments have always been very friendly toward the lot of working people. I cannot condone, however, a reckless disregard of and a disrespect for the public, the Government, and the union movement itself, by those who would wreck organized labor in their efforts to build little empires for themselves. Men like Hoffa and Beck do not serve the best interests of laboring men and women generally, so I am convinced that I voted for that which was right, under the circumstances.

After the Kennedy-Ervin bill had passed the Senate, I told you, George, that labor would do well to support the Senate-passed bill—else you would get even stronger legislation before the session was over. It turned out as I said. Some people were adamant in their opposition to any kind of labor-management reform bill whatsoever, and, if I remember correctly, this represented the position of your national office. A few labor leaders even went so far as to threaten Members of Congress who supported such legislation, and their threats reacted against labor. Many of the people who wrote insisting that we support the bill and many of the people who wrote demanding that no bill be passed at all were entirely unfamiliar with any of the provisions in the bill. I would venture to say that, in various instances, many of those who wrote protesting the bill had been incited to write to us by people like you, George.

I have been a friend of labor throughout my 13 years in public service, and I am confident that fairminded working men and women will not be misled by a few individuals who, because I have not voted exactly as would have pleased them in this instance, would seek to have the union membership believe that I have betrayed labor. I have had my battles with you before, George, and I do not say this disrespectfully, but a man can be with you 99 times and vote opposite to your views once and you will crucify him as one who has betrayed labor.

If certain labor organizations had cleaned house, the people would not have demanded that the Congress do the job. I realize that unions, generally, in West Virginia have not been subjected to dishonest leadership, and I have spoken with pride upon numerous occasions concerning the honesty and fairness of most of the union leaders in West Virginia, but this does not gainsay the fact that a situation had developed in the Nation which could no longer be tolerated.

If blame must be placed somewhere, then, let it rest upon the shoulders of Hoffa and Beck and others of their stripe. Let the blame also be shared by those who publicly defended Hoffa. Your two West Virginia Senators and your House Members did not "stab labor in the back," George; labor's position was undermined by a few reckless leaders who stubbornly refused to read the handwriting on the wall.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator.

SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1959

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of light and love: Our lives here are so swiftly lived; as the

flower that fadeth and the grass that withereth, so are we. It is ours to receive, today, the inheritance of yesterday, and to transmit it, unwasted and unsullied, to tomorrow.

For all that this National Chamber—where free speech is glorified, where the people's voice is heard, with no dictator's padlock on lips—means to the stirring life of these days of ferment, we give Thee thanks.

As another session of this body nears its close, we are grateful for the rich fellowship of minds which, although differing in viewpoint, yet are united in their dedication to great causes; we thank Thee for the joy of discovering common aspirations and sharing in combined achievements.

Save us from nursing our disappointments, from brooding over defeats, or from being haunted by ghostly regrets.